United Nations E/AC.51/1999/2

Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General
31 March 1999

Original: English

Committee for Programme and Coordination
Thirty-ninth session
7 June–2 July 1999
Item 4 (c) of the provisional agenda*
Programme questions: evaluation

Report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services on the in-depth evaluation of the disarmament programme

Note by the Secretary-General

In conformity with paragraph 5 (e) (i) of General Assembly resolution 48/218 B of 29 July 1994, the Secretary-General has the honour to transmit the attached report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services on the in-depth evaluation of the disarmament programme, dated 18 March 1999. The report has been reviewed by the relevant departments and offices. The Secretary-General takes note of its findings and concurs with its recommendations.

* E/AC.51/1999/1.

99-09094 (E) 120599

In-depth evaluation of the Disarmament Programme

Report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services

Summary

The present report reviews the achievements and shortcomings of the disarmament programme in supporting the work of the international disarmament machinery — the First Committee of the General Assembly, the Disarmament Commission and the Conference on Disarmament — implementing General Assembly resolutions and decisions, and providing the assistance requested to parties to multilateral disarmament agreements. The programme is implemented by the Department for Disarmament Affairs of the Secretariat.

Delegations are generally satisfied with Department for Disarmament Affairs secretariat support to multilateral bodies. Shortcomings were mostly related to the technical information provided to Member States, the activities of the regional centres, the Disarmament Information Programme, the cooperation with regional organizations, and development of contacts with specialized agencies, research and non-governmental institutions as mandated in the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly.

Shortcomings are partly, but not entirely, related to the decrease in resources allocated to the programme since 1992, the decrease in extrabudgetary resources being very pronounced. In the meantime, priorities agreed upon at the tenth special session remain pressing and additional tasks have been mandated.

Contents

		Paragraphs	Page
I.	Introduction	1–3	4
II.	United Nations programme on disarmament	4–12	4
	A. Intergovernmental bodies	4–8	4
	B. Secretariat arrangements	9–12	5
III.	Deliberation and negotiation	13–27	6
	A. Secretariat organizational and in-session support to meetings	13–18	6
	1. Conference on Disarmament	14–15	6
	2. Deliberative bodies	16	7
	3. Secretariat support by the Department of General Assembly Affairs and Conference Services	17–18	7
	B. Follow-up to General Assembly resolutions and decisions	19–27	7
	1. Preparation of documentation	19–21	7
	2. Multilateral disarmament agreements	22–27	8
IV.	Following and assessing current and future trends	28–40	9
	A. Studies	29–37	10
	1. Studies by the Department for Disarmament Affairs	29–31	10
	2. Role of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research	32–34	10
	3. Role of the Advisory Board on Disarmament Matters	35–37	11
	B. Disarmament databases	38–40	12
V.	Support for, and promotion of, regional disarmament efforts and initiatives	41–62	13
	A. Confidence-building measures	42–46	13
	B. Cooperating with regional organizations	47	14
	C. Regional centres	48–54	15
	D. Integrated approach to peace and security	55–59	16
	E. Fellowship programme	60–62	17
VI.	Information	63–77	18
	A. Publications	65–69	19
	B. Reference libraries	70	20
	C. Role of non-governmental organizations	71–74	21
	D. Awareness of United Nations disarmament activities	75–77	22
VII.	Recommendations	78	22

I. Introduction

1. At its thirty-seventh session, the Committee for Programme and Coordination recommended to the General Assembly that an in-depth evaluation of the programme on disarmament be prepared for consideration by the Committee in 1999 (A/52/16,[1] para. 306).

2. The in-depth evaluation reviewed all the activities of the programme. During the period of the medium-term plan for 1992–1997, the activities of the programme on disarmament were carried out under four subprogrammes. The medium-term plan for the period 1998–2001 sets out five main objectives, namely, (a) to support deliberation and negotiation; (b) to follow and assess current and future trends; (c) to support and promote regional disarmament efforts and initiatives; (d) to provide factual information on the disarmament efforts of the United Nations; and (e) to continue to inform the public. They reflect the same basic mandates upon which the previous plan was based and incorporate new mandates. The present report follows the structure of the current medium-term plan: deliberation and negotiation (section III); following and assessing current and future trends (section IV); support for, and promotion of, regional disarmament efforts and initiatives (section V); and information (section VI). Disarmament is specifically identified as one of the eight priority areas of work of the Organization in the medium-term plan for the period 1998–2001.

3. In the conduct of the in-depth evaluation, the following categories of information were utilized by the Central Evaluation Unit of the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS): (a) United Nations documents; (b) information from internal sources (the Programme's internal assessments and internal working documents); (c) structured interviews and consultations with a wide range of government representatives in New York and Geneva, members of the Advisory Board on Disarmament Matters, staff of the programme, staff of intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, staff of Secretariat departments and organizations of the United Nations system participating in relevant coordinating mechanisms, such as the Executive Committee on Peace and Security, or previously involved in the activities of the World Disarmament Campaign. Treaty-implementing organizations and regional organizations involved in disarmament-related issues were also consulted.

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifty-second Session, Supplement No. 16.*

II. United Nations programme on disarmament

A. Intergovernmental bodies

4. The Organization's role in disarmament was established by the Charter of the United Nations, Article 11 of which states: "The General Assembly may consider the general principles of cooperation in the maintenance of international peace and security, including the principles governing disarmament and the regulation of armaments, and may make recommendations with regard to such principles to the Members or to the Security Council or to both". Currently, the multilateral machinery through which disarmament issues are considered consists of two kinds of bodies, (a) deliberative — the General Assembly, including the First Committee, and the Disarmament Commission — and (b) negotiating — the Conference on Disarmament. The Department for Disarmament Affairs provides most of the secretariat services for these bodies.

5. The First Committee is the key organ of the General Assembly for disarmament and related international security questions. It adopts relevant draft resolutions and recommends them to the Assembly for adoption. The Disarmament Commission provides a subsidiary forum for deliberation on disarmament issues. It allows for in-depth deliberations on specific issues, leading to the submission of concrete recommendations on those issues. The Commission reports annually to the General Assembly. In 1992, the General Assembly initiated a reassessment of the multilateral arms control and disarmament machinery. Since then, the Commission has further concentrated its efforts on specific subjects. The question of the rationalization of the work of the First Committee remained on the Committee's agenda. In 1998, the Assembly decided to streamline the work of the deliberative bodies and to keep the matter under review (see decisions 52/416 B and 52/492).

6. In 1978, 1982 and 1988 the General Assembly convened special sessions devoted entirely to the question of disarmament (tenth, twelfth and fifteenth special sessions). In 1988, the General Assembly reaffirmed the validity of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session, as reflecting a historic consensus on the part of the international community that the halting and reversing of the arms race, in particular the nuclear-arms race, and the achievement of genuine disarmament are tasks of primary importance and urgency (resolution 43/77 B). In 1994, the General Assembly, welcoming the recent positive changes in the international landscape, decided to convene, in 1997

if possible, the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament (resolution 49/75 I); as at the end of 1998, no consensus has been reached on the date, objectives and agenda for the fourth special session.

7. The Conference on Disarmament is the single multilateral negotiating forum of the international community on arms limitation and disarmament. Following the agreement of Member States, endorsed by the General Assembly at its first special session devoted to disarmament, the Conference is the successor to the previous multilateral negotiating bodies, created outside but linked to the United Nations. In adopting its programme of work, the Conference takes into account the recommendations of the General Assembly and the proposals presented by its members. The Conference reports annually to the General Assembly, or more frequently as appropriate. A personal representative of the Secretary-General serves as the Secretary-General of the Conference. The Conference functions according to its own rules of procedure, which provide for the adoption of all decisions by consensus only. Since its establishment, in 1979, the Conference has included all the nuclear-weapon States and all other militarily significant States; its membership reflects the main political and geographical groups. In 1996, the Conference admitted 23 countries as new members, bringing the total membership to 61. In addition, some 50 States, not members of the Conference, are regularly invited to participate in its work, upon their request.

8. The Conference on Disarmament negotiates multilateral arms limitation and disarmament agreements. It concluded negotiations on the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction, in 1992, and on the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, in 1996. The 1997 session was characterized by a lack of consensus, which was a source of concern. At the opening of the 1998 session the Secretary-General, in his message, stated that the Conference had in the past contributed to the successful negotiation of major global disarmament treaties. Its potential for other multilateral negotiations remained a source of hope and promise for global disarmament (see CD/PV.779). In 1998, the Conference decided to initiate negotiations on a treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices.

B. Secretariat arrangements

9. The implementation of the disarmament programme is guided by the priorities established in the relevant General Assembly resolutions and decisions. Currently the activities under this programme are carried out by the Department for Disarmament Affairs. The Department is located in New York, with one branch at Geneva; it is also responsible for the activities of three regional centres for peace and disarmament. The Advisory Board on Disarmament Matters provides the Secretary-General with advice on matters relevant to its mandate (see paras. 35–37 below).

10. During the period under review, the status of the Department changed several times. In 1992, it was integrated as an Office in the Department of Political Affairs, which had as primary focus of its work preventive diplomacy and peacemaking (proposed programme budget for the biennium 1994–1995 (A/48/6/Rev.1,[2] para. 3.16)). Other than the position of Secretary-General of the Conference on Disarmament, all senior positions above D-1 level were abolished. Early in 1993, the General Assembly urged the Secretary-General to strengthen the Office in order to ensure that it has the necessary means and resources to carry out its mandated tasks (resolution 47/54 G). Subsequently the Office was renamed Centre for Disarmament Affairs. In 1997, the Secretary-General, in his report entitled "Renewing the United Nations: a programme for reform", considered disarmament to be a central issue on the global agenda (A/51/950, para. 122), and proposed the re-establishment of the Department for Disarmament Affairs. The new Department was established at the beginning of 1998 and organized in five branches: the Conference on Disarmament Secretariat and Conference Support Branch (Geneva), the Weapons of Mass Destruction Branch, the Conventional Arms (including Practical Disarmament Measures) Branch, the Monitoring, Database and Information Branch and the Regional Disarmament Branch.

11. Comparing regular budget funds available to the Department for Disarmament Affairs before the 1992 restructuring and after its re-establishment in 1998, it can be noted that, in real terms, the resources of the Department decreased by 22 per cent. The impact on specific activities is reviewed in the different sections below. The decline of extrabudgetary funds is rather sharp. In 1990–1991, extrabudgetary funds were $6.3 million; in 1996–1997, they were $1.4 million, that is, less than a quarter of the 1990–1991 amount. These facts point to a weakened

[2] Ibid., *Forty-eighth session, Supplement No. 6*, vol. I.

capacity of the Secretariat to support the programme. Careful examination of the role of the Secretariat and focus on priority tasks are required but, considering the structure of the departmental workload, the potential for gains through internal rearrangements appears limited.

12. The programme budget for the biennium 1996–1997, as approved by the General Assembly, stated that the efforts of the international community were still focused on weapons of mass destruction, particularly nuclear ones, but were becoming increasingly concerned with the growth and proliferation of various types of conventional weapons (A/50/6/Rev.1,[3] para. 2.81). The programme budget for the biennium 1998–1999 maintains the same approach. At the twenty-ninth session of the Advisory Board on Disarmament Matters, in June 1997, all the members of the Board except one concluded that the responsibilities of the disarmament and arms control sector of the United Nations would increase, and thus supported strengthening its staff and resources. They pointed specifically to additional tasks and duties in the area of practical disarmament in the conventional field, the implementation of arms agreements regarding weapons of mass destruction, the facilitating of regional agreements and confidence-building measures and the current and future tasks associated with the implementation of international agreements on anti-personnel landmines (A/52/282, para. 4).

III. Deliberation and negotiation

A. Secretariat organizational and in-session support to meetings

13. The Department for Disarmament Affairs provides secretariat and administrative services related to the planning, organization and conduct of meetings as well as substantive services that include the preparation and coordination of reports, informal working papers and background information and, as required, substantive statements, as well as legal and technical advice and assistance in facilitating the deliberative and negotiating process. At the end of 1997, technical secretariat support to the deliberative bodies was assumed by the Department of General Assembly Affairs and Conference Services (see paras. 17–18 below).

1. Conference on Disarmament

14. Members of delegations to the Conference on Disarmament, who had been Presidents, Chairpersons or Special Coordinators during the last session of the Conference were interviewed by the Central Evaluation Unit at the end of 1998; all were satisfied with the secretariat services of the Department for Disarmament Affairs. Considering that the position of President of the Conference rotates every four weeks, the representatives observed that, in fact, its secretariat is the memory of the Conference. Department staff prepare internal papers to brief upcoming Presidents on the status of issues; they share their experience on precedents and past proposals. They research, or help identify, documentation needed by the Presidents and other officers of the Conference. One former President stated to the Evaluation Unit that, during a period of intense negotiations when scores of informal consultations were held, his effectiveness had depended on the professional capacity of the secretariat and its logistical support. In particular, at the request of the President, the secretariat advised him on formulations that could achieve consensus, and drafted for him numerous alternative texts. The Secretary-General of the Conference also, as provided by the rules of procedure, and acting as personal representative of the Secretary-General, may provide some informal ideas to assist the Conference and its President in organizing the business and timetables of the Conference (rules of procedure, para. 13). Delegations told the Evaluation Unit that this practice, in addition to informal contacts, contributed to new perspectives.

15. During the period under review, the number of meetings of the Conference varied depending on the intensity of the negotiations under way, and the evolution of the international political and security environment. In 1992, there were 484 meetings, including informal meetings and consultations. In addition, 150 informal consultations were held in the Palais des Nations by delegations only. The number of meetings and consultations serviced by the substantive secretariat remained at similar levels from 1993 to 1996, when the Conference on Disarmament concluded the negotiations on the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty. In 1997 and 1998, the number of meetings and informal consultations decreased to less than 200 a year. Representatives commented that the secretariat's capacity was spread thin when there were intense consultations and negotiations, at which time they exercised restraint in their requests to the secretariat, although they needed, sometimes, more detailed informal documentation than was usually prepared. This capacity might not be used to its full potential in the pre-negotiation phase or between sessions. However,

[3] Ibid., *Fiftieth Session, Supplement No. 6*, vol. I.

the possibilities for pre-session work are limited, as the secretariat mostly responds to needs that evolve in the course of negotiations. Staffing levels remained stable throughout the period under review; it should be noted that, before 1996, staff were regularly deployed from the Department in New York to provide additional support when meetings were held. A few representatives questioned the downgrading, in 1992, of the position of Deputy Secretary-General of the Conference.

2. Deliberative bodies

16. The 1991 in-depth evaluation of the programme by the Central Evaluation Unit indicated that the level of satisfaction with secretariat services of members of the First Committee was high; more than 80 per cent of members of the First Committee who contributed to the survey were satisfied with the services (E/AC.51/1991/2, annex I). Views expressed to the Unit by delegations, at the end of 1998, indicate that this assessment, overall, has not changed. Representatives commented on a few difficulties regarding the scheduling of meetings — overlap with other meetings, indecision about the dates of the session of the First Committee — or the annotated agenda.

3. Secretariat support by the Department of General Assembly Affairs and Conference Services

17. Among the measures announced by the Secretary-General in March 1997, as a first step in the reform process of the Organization, was the integration into the new Department of General Assembly Affairs and Conference Services of the technical secretariat support services of the Department of Political Affairs and the former Department for Policy Coordination and Sustainable Development; responsibility for providing substantive support to intergovernmental bodies continued to reside in the programme departments. The General Assembly noted that the newly created Department would not provide technical support services to the Fifth and Sixth Committees of the General Assembly or to the Security Council. In his 1998 report to the Assembly on the matter, the Secretary-General stated that technical and substantive servicing of the Security Council and the Fifth and Sixth Committees continued to reside in the programme departments. It is observed that the Committee secretaries participate in the weekly working-level coordination meeting convened by the Department of General Assembly Affairs and Conference Services; the meeting has proved a useful tool for horizontal contacts (A/53/452, para. 9).

18. As a consequence of the 1997 reorganization, servicing is now provided to the First Committee and the Disarmament Commission by two departments. The functions of the Department of General Assembly Affairs and Conference Services include advising delegations and Secretariat units and officials on the work of the relevant organs and bodies, and regularly providing analytical briefs to the Secretary-General on major developments in the deliberations of those bodies (ST/SGB/1997/6, para. 7.2 (f)). Substantive assessments are prepared by the Department for Disarmament Affairs and procedural assessments by the Department of General Assembly Affairs and Conference Services. The Department for Disarmament Affairs continues to provide technical and substantive servicing for meetings and conferences of treaty regimes such as the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, with no recourse to any assistance from the Department of General Assembly Affairs and Conference Services. This is a continuation of past practice and has been acceptable to Member States.

B. Follow-up to General Assembly resolutions and decisions

1. Preparation of documentation

(a) Deliberative bodies

19. More than a third of the reports and notes prepared, in 1998, by the Secretariat for the consideration of the First Committee were issued three weeks or less before the beginning of the session. However, most comments by representatives address not the timely processing of the documentation but its contents. The reports are requested by the General Assembly. Very few reports, other than those prepared by groups of governmental experts, contain analyses and/or recommendations. For about a quarter of the reports submitted in 1998, the General Assembly had specifically limited its requests to the Secretariat to submit for consideration by the Assembly information and views received from Member States. For other reports, formulations were broader; there were requests to report on the subject; to report on technological developments, drawing from official sources and from contributions by States; or to update and further develop one previous report. However, in most cases, the approach followed by the Secretariat remains limited to the collation of replies received from Member States, which, more often than not, contain the views of one or two countries and do not provide sufficient official material to report on the subject matter. Delegations commented to the Central Evaluation Unit that,

as in other areas of the work of the Organization, the addition of a brief overview of the issue being considered or factual account of recent developments, in the form of introduction or summary, would make a number of reports more useful.

(b) Negotiating bodies

20. The secretariat of the Conference on Disarmament assists in the preparation of the provisional agenda and the first draft of the reports of the Conference to the General Assembly but most of the documentation is requested by members as the session unfolds. In 1998, the most voluminous sets of documents were compilations on specific topics of documents of past sessions of the Conference, including papers prepared by Governments, working papers or documents prepared in the context of relevant treaty negotiations or review conferences. The compilations offer an overview of proposals and discussions which, sometimes, spread over a period of 10 years or more, and are used as reference documents by delegations, beyond the specific need of the session. Considering the demonstrated capacity of the secretariat to prepare useful background documentation, a number of representatives consider that, in relation to upcoming negotiations, and if mandated to do so, it could coordinate the preparation of background papers on technical issues or historical notes. It should be noted that the rules of procedure, in particular rule 15, provide that at the request of the Conference, the Secretary-General shall provide professional assistance to the Conference by preparing background papers and bibliographies on issues which are the subject of negotiations in the Conference as well as by compiling data and information relevant to the conduct of negotiations. In addition, the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research (UNIDIR) and a number of research institutions and non-governmental organizations provide useful contributions and analyses on issues relating to the work of the Conference on Disarmament.

21. In the context of other conferences of States parties to existing treaties, the preparation of technical inputs by the Department for Disarmament Affairs in the form of official documentation is rare but feasible. For example, the Preparatory Committee for the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons requested that background documentation be prepared by the Secretariat on the overall implementation of several articles of the Treaty, reflecting, *inter alia*, important political developments directly relevant. After amendments and updating requested by the Committee, the papers were submitted to the Conference.

2. Multilateral disarmament agreements

22. Mandated follow-up actions regarding the multilateral disarmament agreements were carried out under subprogramme 1 of the medium-term plan for the period 1992–1997. Activities to address the challenges arising from the implementation of relevant treaties, part of the second objective of the medium-term plan for the period 1998–2001, will be reviewed in this section also.

23. The Department for Disarmament Affairs carries out the functions deriving from the Secretary-General's role as depositary of multilateral disarmament agreements, and by request of States parties, which involves monitoring the process of the signature and ratification of those agreements. Services provided at the request of the General Assembly for review conferences and other relevant meetings are not limited to agreements for which the Secretary-General is depositary. The advocacy role of the Secretary-General, to ensure early entry into force of a treaty and, a concern frequently expressed by Member States, its universality, is carried out under specific provisions of a convention, at the request of United Nations bodies or under a broad interpretation of the Secretary-General's moral obligation, and concerns any matter which in his opinion may threaten the maintenance of international peace and security under Article 99 of the Charter.

24. In most cases, the action of the Secretary-General is limited to communications to heads of State or Government appealing for their leadership in ensuring their country's signature and early ratification of a specific agreement. The Secretary-General's meetings and travels are also the occasion of consultations. Secretariat staff gave the rate of ratifications of the Chemical Weapons Convention as an example of the effectiveness of the Secretary-General's action. In 1993 and 1994, 19 States ratified the Convention; after two appeals by the Secretary-General, in 1995 and 1997, 87 additional States ratified the Convention. However, considering the dynamics of treaty ratification, the Secretary-General's action should be seen as one among several factors. The Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects, opened for signature in 1981, had only 73 parties as at 15 March 1999; in contrast, by the same date, 67 States had ratified the Ottawa Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction, one year after it was opened for signature. The Secretariat of the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons stated to OIOS that, to increase further the effectiveness of the steps taken by the Secretary-General, the Department for

Disarmament Affairs could consult more closely with the relevant treaty organizations in order to receive specialized advice on the problems that States are facing in relation to treaty ratification.

25. Briefings and seminars that the Department for Disarmament Affairs organizes may promote treaty ratification. However, the resources of the Department are insufficient to pursue an overall strategy. For example, the promotion of adherence to nuclear-weapon-free zone arrangements, encouraged by Member States, would require Department staff to attend a number of regional meetings, or the Secretariat to sponsor meetings for State representatives to discuss such matters and provide technical assistance. Funds are available to support negotiations, and cover the participation of international experts, but are lacking for the promotion of ratification by the Secretariat.

26. On several occasions, the General Assembly endorsed assistance by the Secretariat, on request, to States parties to multilateral disarmament agreements in their duty to ensure the effective functioning of such agreements (resolution 31/90). The assistance of the Secretariat has been mostly limited to servicing review conferences and to facilitating the exchange of information between parties. Follow-up action on multilateral agreements is basically a governmental function. To support States parties with regard to the implementation of verification provisions and other provisions of treaties, a few dedicated bodies were established; parties have also relied on the technical services of existing specialized agencies. Collaboration between the Secretariat and the treaty organizations varies with the provisions of different treaties. Regarding the Chemical Weapons Convention, several Department staff members assisted in the establishment of the provisional technical secretariat of the Preparatory Committee for the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons, and in the holding of the first meeting of the States signatories. As the Convention provides that the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons may refer certain matters to specific organs of the United Nations, the Secretariats of the United Nations and that organization are currently negotiating a relationship agreement. Comparable support was provided to the Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization. In addition, a preparatory commission international cooperation programme is being developed to support requests for assistance and other needs, with Department advice. Under the terms of the Ottawa Convention, the United Nations and the Secretary-General would be required to play a prominent role that exceeds the traditional duties of a depositary (A/C.1/52/L.47, para. 2); different functions include, *inter alia*, the maintenance of a specialized database; the appointment of fact-finding missions; and assistance in the elaboration of domestic mine-clearance programmes.

27. The monitoring of treaty implementation follows the legal framework of each treaty and the experience gained within that framework. Difficulties in implementing specific treaties are somewhat documented but there is no comparative overview. In their 1995 report, the Group of Governmental Experts on Verification in All its Aspects noted that the nature of verification had evolved both as practical experience increased and as the verification objectives became increasingly diversified. An important lesson seemed to be that verification in each context might benefit from the experience gained and methods used in the others (A/50/377 and Corr.1, para. 204). The Group recommended, *inter alia*, that the Secretary-General encourage and facilitate the development of communication channels and other contacts among verification implementing organizations. The General Assembly encouraged Member States to consider the recommendations contained in the report and to assist the Secretary-General in their implementation where they considered it appropriate (resolution 50/61). In response to queries by the Central Evaluation Unit, the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) stated that it foresaw possibilities for further cooperation with the Department for Disarmament Affairs, specifically in the context of nuclear-weapon-free zones, verification regimes, and exploring synergies between verification pertaining to weapons of mass destruction. The secretariat of the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons agrees with the IAEA statement, provided that the independent status of organizations involved, and their respective rules on protection of sensitive information, are taken into account. In 1998, UNIDIR developed a project for a series of seminars with international treaty-implementing organizations in order to highlight common interests and problems, encourage ratification and implementation and promote dialogue between practitioners (A/53/187, para. 23). Implementation was initiated in 1999; to avoid duplicating work, the Department could collaborate with UNIDIR in this respect.

IV. Following and assessing current and future trends

28. The second objective of the programme for the medium-term plan for the period 1998–2001 — to follow and assess current and future trends in the field of disarmament and international security in order to assist

Member States, and to enable the Secretary-General also to assist them, in their search for agreement (General Assembly resolution 51/219, annex, programme 1, para. 1.15) — is a continuation of subprogramme 3, Monitoring, analysis and studies, of the medium-term plan for the period 1992–1997.

A. Studies

1. Studies by the Department for Disarmament Affairs

29. In the Final Document of its first special session devoted to disarmament, the General Assembly considered that taking further steps in the field of disarmament and other measures aimed at promoting international peace and security would be facilitated by carrying out studies by the Secretary-General in this field with appropriate assistance from governmental or consultant experts (resolution S-10/2, para. 96). The Secretary-General was requested to set up an advisory board of eminent persons, to advise him on various aspects of these studies (see paras. 35–37 below). The Advisory Board on Disarmament Matters identified three purposes for studies mandated by the General Assembly, namely, to assist in ongoing negotiations; to identify possible new areas of negotiation; and to promote public awareness of the problems involved in the arms race and disarmament (A/42/300, para. 5).

30. In 1987, the Board commented that as studies had evolved, the exercises had changed somewhat in nature. There might have been a trend in the mandates from the General Assembly towards the appointment of governmental rather than consultant participating experts. That tendency had been of value in that the studies had thus often reflected authoritative views and, when a consensus had been reached on substance, the studies might have indicated an opening towards genuine negotiations (A/42/300, paras. 3 and 8–10). The evolution identified in that report was even more pronounced in the 1990s. The studies are almost exclusively an input into the work of the deliberative bodies. In general, the recommendations they contain are endorsed by the General Assembly. The Member States are called upon, and the Secretary-General requested, to implement the relevant recommendations. The involvement of the Department for Disarmament Affairs, in the preparation of the studies, falls under "servicing of intergovernmental and expert bodies" (A/52/6/Rev.1,[4] para. 2.128). For example, in 1997, the Centre for Disarmament Affairs provided the following support to the Panel of Governmental Experts on Small Arms: preparing an annotated bibliographical survey of publications and supplying documents requested by the experts; liaising with reputed scholars making presentations before the Panel; planning and organizing workshops; and drafting sections of the report. Since 1980, the number of studies mandated by the General Assembly has decreased steadily. There were 23 studies during the period 1980–1985; 12 in 1986–1991; and 5 in 1992–1997. Several factors are cited to explain this decrease besides the political process of which the studies are part. One of them is the cost of such exercises under the present format, another is the establishment of UNIDIR which provides opportunities for other ways of carrying out disarmament studies and research.

31. The need for another kind of study by the Department for Disarmament Affairs continues. For example, at its fifty-second session, the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to initiate a study on the problems of ammunition and explosives in all their aspects, as early as possible, within available financial resources, and in cooperation with appropriate international and regional organizations where necessary (resolution 52/38 J). The study is carried out by the Department at a minimal cost, with the participation of UNIDIR. Delegations and representatives of other organizations provided to the Central Evaluation Unit multiple suggestions of topics for study. The small number of studies and expert reports the Department prepares, for the Secretary-General and the General Assembly, are generally commissioned from consultants and experts hired for the occasion. In that respect, it should be recalled that, at its first special session devoted to disarmament, the Assembly considered that the Centre for Disarmament should take account fully of the possibilities offered by specialized agencies and other institutions and programmes within the United Nations system with regard to studies and information on disarmament, and should also increase contacts with non-governmental organizations and research institutions in view of the valuable role they play in the field of disarmament (resolution S-10/2, para. 123).

2. Role of the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research

32. The United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research is an autonomous institution within the framework of the United Nations, established — through interim arrangements in 1979, and formally in 1984 — by the General Assembly for the purpose of undertaking independent research on disarmament and related problems, particularly international security issues, and working in close relationship with the Department for Disarmament

[4] Ibid., *Fifty-second Session, Supplement No. 6*, vol. I.

Affairs (resolution 39/148 H, annex, statute of UNIDIR, article I). One of the purposes of such work — assisting ongoing negotiations by means of objective and factual studies and analyses (ibid., article II) — contributes to the work of the Conference on Disarmament. Topics taken up by UNIDIR are policy relevant. The UNIDIR research programme for 1998–1999 comprises four main headings, namely, collective security in the framework of the United Nations; regional security; non-proliferation; and the fourth special session devoted to disarmament. UNIDIR contributes to networks of research institutes in several regional contexts, which are particularly useful in exploring issues when only non-governmental (track II) deliberations can be conducted. With regard to the work of the Conference on Disarmament, UNIDIR may help sort out the questions involved and provide factual material for subsequent consideration. This was the case with the issue of nuclear fissile material, a subject of UNIDIR papers and seminars since 1994. In addition, UNIDIR helps to inform a wider public about issues being negotiated, through, *inter alia*, its *Newsletter* — now renamed *Disarmament Forum*. In 1998, UNIDIR launched a series of informal "discussion meetings" on the future of the Conference on Disarmament, to encourage open dialogue in an informal setting. UNIDIR participates in another discussion series, the Geneva Forum, which seeks to act as a bridge between the international research community and Geneva-based diplomats and journalists; there are about six annual meetings. During the last annual reporting period, UNIDIR published seven research reports, not including its briefs and *Newsletter*. In June 1998, there were 13 ongoing projects, and 8 projects in development.

33. The Advisory Board on Disarmament Matters serves as the Board of Trustees of UNIDIR; the UNIDIR research programme is approved by the Board, duly taking into account the recommendations of the General Assembly (resolution 37/99 K, sect. IV). Members of the Board stated to the Central Evaluation Unit that, until now, in their functions as Trustees, they had not been effective in assisting UNIDIR in making decisions on the future orientation of its programme or raising funds for its activities. In the mid-1990s, the collaboration with the Department for Disarmament Affairs was not as close as desirable. [*In response, the Department stated to OIOS that it "did review the UNIDIR programme of work on a regular basis. Even when similar subjects were addressed by both the Department and UNIDIR, different aspects were considered or different approaches, in line with the respective mandates of the two offices, were used."*] In spite of UNIDIR's unique relation to the Conference on Disarmament, it does not enjoy the status of observer at the Conference. [*In response, the Department stated to OIOS: "the rules of procedure of the Conference on Disarmament have no provisions for granting observer status to any organizations; observer status is only envisaged for Member States, that so request. UNIDIR cannot also be considered as part of the Secretariat."*] After the nomination of the new Director of UNIDIR, in 1997, the collaboration with the Department made a new start and UNIDIR increased its support to delegations to the Conference, regarding current developments. Expert meetings organized by UNIDIR are now more cost-effective and are designed to address specific needs. The direction given to the UNIDIR programme by the new Director received strong support from the main donors, and her fund-raising campaigns have been successful. The estimated total income of the Institute for 1998 is $1.5 million, an increase of over $0.8 million compared to the initial estimates.

34. UNIDIR activities are funded by voluntary contributions, which mainly cover costs associated with the organization of seminars, publications and the appointment of senior fellows, consultants and correspondents to carry out or advise on studies and research. A subvention towards meeting the costs of the Director and the staff of the Institute is provided from the regular budget of the United Nations. The regular budget subvention had been maintained at $220,000 yearly since 1990, and was reduced to $213,000 in 1996, owing to system-wide reductions. The Board of Trustees has requested a restoration of the $220,000 subvention and that it be adjusted for inflation. The subvention originally covered the cost of three posts and currently covers only two. A number of long-term core staff have been paid over the years by one-month to one-year contracts, with no provision for medical insurance or pension contributions. In the present funding situation, if staff were placed on regular United Nations contracts, not all core staff could be retained and UNIDIR would not function.

3. Role of the Advisory Board on Disarmament Matters

35. The functions of the Advisory Board on Disarmament Matters, established in 1978, are (a) to advise the Secretary-General on various aspects of studies and research in the area of arms limitation and disarmament; (b) to serve as the Board of Trustees of UNIDIR; (c) to advise the Secretary-General on the implementation of the World Disarmament Campaign; and (d) at the invitation of the Secretary-General, to provide him with advice on other matters within this area (General Assembly resolution 37/99 K, sect. III). Only functions (b) to (d) are still clearly relevant.

36. The question of the Board's role and of its working methods has frequently been the subject of discussion. In 1994, the Board agreed with the Secretary-General that it would not rely entirely on requests for advice by him but would be proactive in making suggestions and bringing issues to his attention (see A/49/360, para. 14). The Secretary-General welcomed the intention of members of the Board to work between sessions in subgroups. In 1998, to improve its effectiveness, it was suggested that the Board take a more proactive and result-oriented approach by formulating its advice in terms of specific recommendations to the Secretary-General. Board members agreed to take more advantage of the new communications potential to remain in contact with each other, the Chairman, the Department for Disarmament Affairs and UNIDIR with a view to sharing their opinions on important relevant developments. It was suggested once again that Board members serve, as appropriate, on various United Nations missions and assignments, and members also agreed that they could serve as links between the Department and academic institutions and other organizations (see A/53/222, paras. 38–45).

37. In recent years, efforts were made to ensure the membership of the Board would include a wide range of expertise. The Board has access to the Secretary-General and to the Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs but, in the past, the independent expertise of its members has been largely untapped. The Board does not operate to produce one collective view; it rather explores, in open discussion, areas to test where consensus could emerge at a later date. Board meetings do not represent the conclusion of an annual programme of research to develop proposals on a set of issues. The Department normally supplies the Board members with a well-prepared annotated agenda and reading materials before each session. However, this interaction takes place just before the meetings and does not have the desirable continuity. Board members noted that, since 1998, they were more regularly informed of Department activities. In response to comments by former Board members to the effect that the Department should submit to the Board concrete suggestions on contributions expected from it, as from 1998 the Department has formulated specific questions for the Board's advice.

B. Disarmament databases

38. The provision of a well-researched database on new trends and developments — under subprogramme 3 of the medium-term plan for the period 1992–1997 — was primarily meant to enable the Secretary-General to assist Member States. The Department for Disarmament Affairs is currently keeping up to date a number of country profiles, based on documentation both official and in the public domain, which summarize relevant legislative actions, positions taken on key disarmament issues and United Nations resolutions. They also contain the data submitted by Governments to the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms. They enable Department officers to prepare on short notice briefing notes for the attention of the Secretary-General, to ensure that disarmament issues are adequately reflected in his consultations with Member States. There are also topical databases, such as the database being developed on weapons of mass destruction, to assist States parties to multilateral disarmament agreements.

39. The involvement of the Department for Disarmament Affairs in the collection of official data on armaments began in 1980, when it compiled information received from Governments on their military expenditures. In 1992, a new instrument, the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms, was established. From the perspective of the Department, these instruments are in fact confidence-building measures (see paras. 42–46 below). From the perspective of officers in other departments, the data contained in the Department's databases should be operationally useful. Frequently, when demobilization and disarmament are components of the mandates of United Nations peacekeeping operations, comprehensive disarmament programmes are not achieved, for a variety of reasons, including the fact, as in Mozambique during the implementation of the mandate of the United Nations Operation in Mozambique, that nobody knew how many weapons were in circulation.[5] Some offices in the Department of Peacekeeping Operations and the Department of Political Affairs commented to the Central Evaluation Unit that it would be helpful if the Department developed profiles of armament for countries in crisis. However, it was observed that setting up such a database is labour-intensive; arms accumulations evolve rapidly and, at the end of the day, the Department may provide information not noticeably different from that published by non-governmental organizations.

40. In the early 1980s, the Department was mandated by the General Assembly to report on nuclear capability in South Africa and Israel; at that time, it used information available within the Organization and provided estimates which proved to have a good degree of accuracy. One

[5] UNIDIR, "Small arms management and peacekeeping in southern Africa" (1996).

participant in the United Nations advisory mission to Mali (see para. 56 below) commented to the Central Evaluation Unit that the information he needed for the mission was not available in the Department, although it existed in different parts of the United Nations system. Access to existing information is sometimes difficult. The Department for Disarmament Affairs confirmed that it has difficult access to country profiles and other information in the Departments of Political Affairs and Peacekeeping Operations; a joint databank or other arrangements for closer collaboration would be useful, especially to obtain first-hand information from field missions. Moreover, the status of information exchanged between members of other intergovernmental organizations is unclear, as is what use the Department can make of it. For example, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) has been developing a global exchange of military information; OSCE participating States have been implementing this annual exchange since its adoption on 3 December 1994. In 1998, the Department decided that, as part of the United Nations mechanism for Coordinating Action on Small Arms, information on the categories, quantities and transfers of small arms forwarded to the Department by United Nations agencies and other departments will be stored in a database. The regular upgrading of electronic equipment and application at Headquarters is improving the access to information of the Department's staff. Comparable investments were not made at Geneva, where Department staff cannot have easy access to Department databases in New York, let alone access to external sources. In the future, upgrading of electronic equipment and application should be done simultaneously in New York and Geneva, through joint action of the New York and Geneva technical services.

V. Support for, and promotion of, regional disarmament efforts and initiatives

41. The third objective of the medium-term plan for the period 1998–2001 is to support and promote regional disarmament efforts and initiatives using approaches freely arrived at among the States of the region. This was the main objective of subprogramme 4 of the medium-term plan for the period 1992–1997, which focused primarily on services provided for the benefit of the developing countries. The subprogramme included the work of the regional centres and the fellowship programme, activities which will be reviewed in this section.

A. Confidence-building measures

42. In 1992, the General Assembly, stressing the need to encourage Member States and regional arrangements and organizations to play a leading role in developing confidence-building measures, commended such measures as the promotion of openness and restraint in the production, procurement and deployment of armaments (resolution 47/120 A, sect. IV). The United Nations Register of Conventional Arms was established in 1992, and is maintained centrally by the Department for Disarmament Affairs, pursuant to the request of the General Assembly, recognizing that an increased level of transparency in the field of armaments would enhance confidence (resolution 46/36 L). The Assembly called upon Member States to provide annually for the Register data on imports and exports of seven categories of conventional arms. The panel of governmental technical experts, convened in 1992, which assisted in defining the modalities of reporting to the Register, and the groups of governmental experts convened in 1994 and 1997, discussed the operation of the Register and modalities for the expansion of its scope.

43. Regarding participation, the 1997 Group of Experts was encouraged to note that the level of participation remained one of the highest compared with similar international reporting instruments (A/52/316, para. 11). Every year over 90 Governments regularly submit reports; 138 Governments have participated at least once by reporting. However, the Group was concerned that the goal of universal participation had not yet been reached and noted that the level of reporting varied from region to region — 15 per cent of States reporting from one region, 100 per cent from another. The Group of Experts considered that non-participation in the Register might be due to political and technical reasons, and that some States might not be convinced that the Register alone was relevant to their security concerns (ibid., para. 17). The Group noted the importance of the role of the Secretariat in giving advice to Member States, when requested, on technical aspects of completing reports (ibid., para. 52). It commended the Centre for Disarmament Affairs for its efforts to organize and participate in a number of regional workshops. There is no clear indication that the level of reporting was influenced by the workshops, although it is observed that they provided useful information to reporting Governments and may have played a role in related initiatives taken by regional arrangements and agencies. In 1996, members of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) Regional Forum agreed to circulate to each other their reports to the Register at the time they were submitted. The same year, the

General Assembly of the Organization of American States (OAS) requested members to send their submissions to the Register also to the Secretary-General of OAS. For its part, OSCE made information exchange on the Register submissions obligatory between its members. The Group of Experts recommended that the Secretariat enhance the information on the Register and, when requested, support regional efforts. In 1998, the Department for Disarmament Affairs published an information booklet on all aspects of the operation of the Register; Member States have access to the computerized data contained in the Register, and the consolidated annual report is issued as a General Assembly document.

44. To enhance the effectiveness of this tool, consideration was given to regional (or subregional) adaptation to complement the Register. For example, in 1995, delegations to the United Nations Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa (see para. 51 below) considered that the Register in its present form was too restrictive in the categories of weapons with which it is concerned and that the establishment of a subregional arms register that would take into account data such as force levels and light weapons would be a valid contribution to the existing Register (A/50/474, para. 11). The Organization of African Unity (OAU) decided to develop a regional register; OAU staff stated to the Central Evaluation Unit that Department support would be useful to implement this initiative.

45. In contrast to the Register, participation in the United Nations system of standardized reporting of military expenditures, established in 1980 as a means to increase confidence between States, in the move towards agreed and balanced reductions in military expenditures (General Assembly resolution 35/142 B), remained much lower — 27 Member States reporting in 1998 — although General Assembly resolutions on it are adopted by consensus. In 1997, the General Assembly endorsed the intention of the Secretary-General to resume consultations with relevant international and regional organizations receiving reports on military expenditures, with a view to ascertaining the requirements for adjusting the reporting instrument to encourage wider participation (resolution 52/32). Five major recommendations emerged from consultations in 1998, including raising the profile of the reporting instrument, eliminating technical impediments to participation in the system, and enhancing the complementarity of and cooperation among the different international and regional reporting instruments. The General Assembly recommended the guidelines and recommendations for objective information on military matters to all Member States for implementation, fully taking into account specific conditions prevailing in a region (resolution 53/72).

46. In its response to queries by the Central Evaluation Unit, OSCE stated that it found the consultations very useful since the organization's participating States had agreed upon a mandatory information exchange on military expenditures in the framework of the Vienna Document 1994 (see paras. 40 and 43 above). Many non-NATO OSCE participating States have joined the NATO Partnership for Peace programme and a large percentage of these have decided to participate in the Partnership for Peace planning and review process which, *inter alia*, seeks information on defence expenditures. In its response to queries by the Central Evaluation Unit, NATO recalled that a number of member countries observed that reporting of this information to both organizations required a duplication of effort.

B. Cooperating with regional organizations

47. In 1993, the General Assembly endorsed the guidelines and recommendations for regional approaches to disarmament within the context of global security adopted by the Disarmament Commission. The guidelines recommended, *inter alia*, that the United Nations seek to promote complementarity between regional and global processes of disarmament by establishing effective liaison and cooperation with relevant regional bodies (A/48/42,[6] annex II, para. 51). Instances of collaboration are appreciated by regional organizations. In the Asia and Pacific region, the secretariat of the ASEAN Regional Forum organized a seminar in 1997 on nuclear issues. The Department for Disarmament Affairs contributed to the seminar, and was also helpful in facilitating the participation of the Forum secretariat in meetings of the Preparatory Committee and the review conference of the parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. However, in general, collaboration with regional organizations has not been established, or is not as sustained as it should. The Agency for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean (OPANAL) has special cooperation agreements with organizations such as IAEA, and it has carried out activities with a number of them, including IAEA and UNIDIR. No agreement was concluded between the Department for Disarmament Affairs and OPANAL for cooperation and information exchange purposes. OPANAL stated to OIOS that it is interested in concluding such agreement during

[6] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Forty-Eighth Session, Supplement No. 42.*

1999. OAU interest in disarmament is linked to a number of issues such as the proliferation of small arms, landmines and demobilization, and implementation of disarmament treaties. OAU officers commented to the Central Evaluation Unit that Department support would be useful, in particular to facilitate the exchange of experience and information with other regions, including Governments and organizations involved in the implementation of nuclear-weapon-free zone agreements. However, they observed that modalities for collaboration with the Department, in the context of the guidelines adopted by the Commission in 1993, have not been defined. The United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa, set up at the request of the heads of State and Government of OAU, is expected to provide technical assistance to both the OAU Mechanism for Conflict Prevention, Management and Resolution and the security mechanisms of subregional organizations. The 1997 joint mission of the Department of Political Affairs and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) to review the role of the Centre observed that its Director should be someone who could work in close collaboration and consultation with OAU. The OAU officers consulted at the time of the joint mission had not been informed, by the end of 1998, of measures taken for the revitalization of the Centre.

C. Regional centres

48. The three United Nations regional centres for peace and disarmament in Africa, Asia and the Pacific, and Latin America and the Caribbean were established to seek to promote relations based on mutual confidence and security between the countries of the respective regions in a spirit of solidarity and cooperation for the implementation of measures for peace and disarmament (revised medium-term plan for the period 1992–1997 (A/47/6/Rev. 1,[7] para. 7.50)).

49. The activities of the Regional Centre in Asia and the Pacific focused on the organization of regional meetings, one of them being organized every year since 1988 at Kathmandu. The regional dialogue promoted by the Centre through the annual meetings is known as the "Kathmandu process". The continuation of this process as a means of identifying pressing disarmament and security issues and exploring region-oriented solutions has gained the strong support of Member States and academic groups within the region. The fact that, in 1997 and 1998, the Director of the Centre was invited to 11 conferences and meetings sponsored by Governments and non-governmental organizations, at the expense of the sponsors, provides an indication of the interest in the work of the Centre.

50. Government representatives consulted by the Centre, in 1997, concluded, *inter alia*, that it should more widely publicize its activities not only in the region but across the world, and that as part of its efforts to widen its discussions to non-state actors the Centre should establish a web of relationships with other relevant organizations. Proceedings of the meetings are published which contribute to the dissemination of in-depth analyses. On increasing the visibility of the work of the Centre, suggestions were made such as designing a broader mailing list, reaching policy makers and think-tank organizations, or organizing joint meetings with relevant organizations.

51. The Regional Centre in Africa, at Lome, after its establishment in 1986, launched a number of initiatives in research and training, in addition to participating in the World Disarmament Campaign through seminars and the publication of a quarterly newsletter. Since 1990, the Centre has increasingly limited its activities to routine information tasks. Among its earlier initiatives, in 1988, the Centre provided support to the Economic Community of Central African States conference on the promotion of confidence, security and development in Central Africa. Participants in a follow-up seminar, in 1991, recommended, *inter alia*, the creation under United Nations auspices of the Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa. Since the establishment of that Committee in 1992, a number of related activities would have been relevant to the mandate of the Centre; however, it lacked the capability to contribute meaningfully to the work of the Committee. After 1992, voluntary contributions to the Centre decreased sharply, and the post of Director remained vacant from 1992 until 1998. The 1997 Department of Political Affairs/UNDP mission (see para. 47 above) concluded that there was a broad consensus that the Centre ought to operate as a small coordinating unit for research, training and information dissemination on conflicts, peace-building and the non-proliferation of arms and landmines in Africa and that the Centre should be revitalized.

52. The Heads of State and Government of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), in October 1998, declared a moratorium on the importation, exportation and manufacture of small arms and light weapons in West Africa (see A/53/763–S/1998/1194). The Organization of African Unity and the United Nations were called upon to ensure the adoption of similar steps in other regions of Africa. At the end of 1998, UNDP launched a project to work with Governments, organizations such as OAU and

[7] Ibid., *Forty-seventh Session, Supplement No. 6*, vol. I.

ECOWAS, non-governmental organizations and weapons suppliers in backstopping the implementation of the moratorium. UNDP decided that the Lome Centre — the existing international structure mandated to promote disarmament initiatives in the region — would serve as the lead agency for the project.

53. The activities of the Centre in Latin America and the Caribbean, at Lima, have never attracted an adequate level of voluntary contributions; they were limited to a few seminars attended by experts, routine information tasks and the publication of a quarterly newsletter. Following the resignation of the Director in 1993, the post remained vacant until 1998. In 1996, owing to the lack of sufficient voluntary contributions to maintain even a minimal activity, the Secretary-General decided to suspend the operations of the Centre. Since then several Governments have indicated their interest in reactivating the Centre, and a number of organizations, including UNDP, OAS and several research institutes have stated that, should the Centre be reactivated, there might be areas of common interest and activity. In 1998, OPANAL explored the possibilities of planning for 1999 a seminar on disarmament issues relevant to the region, organized jointly with the Lima Centre and the Peruvian Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The Government of Peru responded positively to this initiative.

54. With the exception of the posts of Director, to be financed from the regular budget, voluntary contributions were envisaged as the source of financing of the Centres. The Secretary-General reported in 1995 that the voluntary contributions on which the centres depended primarily for their operations had dwindled over the years, and the financial situation of the regional centres had become precarious resulting in drastically curtailed activities (A/C.5/50/33, para. 14). The most seriously affected were the Lome and Lima Centres. The Kathmandu Centre is affected by limited contributions to cover its administrative and related costs, while it attracts levels of voluntary resources that are sufficient to enable it to carry out valuable work (A/52/309/Add.1 and Corr.1, annex III). In 1997, the General Assembly decided to retain the three P-5 posts of the Directors of the regional centres, which had been proposed for abolition, requested the Secretary-General to fill those posts in the shortest possible time, and invited Member States to support the centres (resolution 52/220, section III, para. 26). The posts were filled in 1998. Several representatives of organizations familiar with the work of the centres stressed that the new Directors should define a plan of action relevant to their regions and congruent with expected resources, a strategy adopted by the Kathmandu Centre, which explains its relative success.

Income of the disarmament trust funds for the United Nations regional centres for peace and disarmament
(Thousands of dollars)

Centres	*1990–1991*	*1992–1993*	*1994–1995*	*1996–1997*
Africa	771.9	427.6	141.9	73.0
Asia and the Pacific	138.5	644.5[a]	204.9	164.6
Latin America and the Caribbean	65.9	190.1[b]	81.4	29.5

[a] One-time donation of $500,000 for construction of a centre at Kathmandu; returned to the donor in 1997 upon its request.

[b] Including funds for a seminar organized at Asunción in January 1993.

D. Integrated approach to peace and security

55. The Charter of the United Nations envisages disarmament and the regulation of armaments as elements in the establishment and maintenance of international peace and security with the least diversion for armaments of the world's human and economic resources (Article 26). In 1989, the General Assembly recalled the principles of the Charter and linked the maintenance of peace and security with resolving international problems of a political, economic, social, cultural or humanitarian character (resolution 44/21). The Department for Disarmament Affairs is expected to contribute to an integrated approach to issues relating to the maintenance of peace and security (resolution 51/219, annex, programme 1, para. 1.19).

56. An integrated and proportional approach to security and development was adopted by the Secretary-General in 1995 when he dispatched an advisory mission to the Sahara-Sahel region, with the support of seven States of the region, with a view to assisting those States in their efforts to combat and stem the illicit flow of light weapons within and across their borders (A/50/1, para. 957). In 1997 the Panel of Governmental Experts on Small Arms recommended that such an approach be extended to other regions of the world where conflicts come to an end. The Department for Disarmament Affairs provided support to the deliberative bodies and Member States to review, with consideration given to a more integrated approach to practical disarmament measures, the experience gained in conflict resolution. In this regard, concerned Member States have established an open-ended group of interested States in practical disarmament measures that, with the technical and substantive assistance of the Department, provides political

and financial support to concrete measures of practical disarmament. In order to facilitate this work, the Department has established a Trust Fund for Consolidation of Peace through Practical Disarmament Measures, which receives voluntary financial contributions from Member States to assist in this kind of project. In his 1998 report to the Security Council on the causes of conflict and the promotion of durable peace and sustainable development in Africa (A/52/871–S/1998/318) the Secretary-General also emphasized the need for such an approach.

57. An integrated approach means both the integration in substance, such as disarmament and development, or disarmament and security and peace, and of actors, such as the Department for Disarmament Affairs and the Departments of Political Affairs and Peacekeeping Operations, UNDP and UNIDIR. Regarding the implementation of the action programme adopted by the 1987 International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, no major initiatives — besides a number of studies by several organizations, such as the International Labour Organization on the employment impact of disarmament — were reported. In 1998, it was decided to replace the high-level interdepartmental task force established after the Conference with a high-level steering group on disarmament and development, with the participation of the Department for Disarmament Affairs, the Department of Economic and Social Affairs and UNDP. Early in 1998, the request to the Secretary-General by the Government of Albania for expert assessment provided the Department for Disarmament Affairs with the second opportunity, after the Sahara-Sahel region, to develop an integrated approach to disarmament and development, linking the disarming of civilians with a package containing community development projects. This approach could be used in countries facing the problem of demobilization of former combatants.

58. In 1997, coordination mechanisms within the United Nations system were enhanced. The Executive Committee on Peace and Security has been useful in ensuring that the disarmament dimension was adequately reflected in a number of situations. In the case of multidimensional peacekeeping operations and political missions, interdepartmental working groups, chaired by the Departments of Peacekeeping Operations and Political Affairs respectively, provide a vehicle for coordinating all interested entities within the United Nations system at the working level. Normally, representatives of the two Departments brief the Security Council on situations of interest to the Council. The Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs was given the lead to coordinate the Secretariat response in one situation where disarmament was the prevalent issue. The Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs does not sit in the Executive Committee on the United Nations Development Group but joint meetings are held in case of cross-over activities, in which issues such as post-conflict rehabilitation are discussed. The launching, in August 1998, of the mechanism for Coordinating Action on Small Arms, with the designation of the Department for Disarmament Affairs as the focal point for all action on small arms within the United Nations system, was an important step towards mutual consultation and exchange of information, involving a large number of programmes, including programmes dealing primarily with development issues. Wider collaboration was initiated with organizations, such as Interpol, interested in developing partnerships to address the problem of trafficking in firearms and explosives.

59. The mainstreaming of gender issues is another aspect of such integration. As stated in the Beijing Platform for Action, the full participation of women in power structures and their full involvement in all efforts for the prevention and resolution of conflicts are essential for the maintenance and promotion of peace.[8] Women now occupy senior positions in both the Department for Disarmament Affairs and UNIDIR. In 1999, a woman was appointed Chair of the Advisory Board on Disarmament Matters. In responding to queries by the Central Evaluation Unit, the Director of the New York office of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom stated that beyond women's participation in the structures of the United Nations, nurturing the articulation and sympathy for a gender perspective is another level of commitment, which the United Nations system is just beginning to embrace, for example through such projects as Rebuilding War-Torn Societies, of the United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD) at Geneva.

E. Fellowship programme

60. The two objectives of the fellowship programme, launched in 1978, were to contribute (a) to the training and specialization of national officials, particularly those from developing countries, and (b) to enable them to participate more effectively in international deliberating and negotiating forums, and also to provide expertise at the national level.

[8] *Report of the Fourth World Conference on Women, Beijing, 4–15 September 1995* (United Nations publication, Sales No. E.96.IV.13), chap. I, resolution 1, annex II, para.134.

The programme was originally a six-month course; after 1988, owing to budgetary constraints, it was gradually reduced to a course of 10 to 12 weeks. The last major reduction, in 1992, was presented as the result of a streamlining of the programme, without compromising its quality (A/47/568). This reduction permitted an increase in the number of fellows from 25 to 30 per year. Since 1997, the number of fellowships has been reduced to 25.

61. The programme includes lectures, simulation exercises and the preparation of individual research papers. In recent years, typically, fellows observed the proceedings of the Conference on Disarmament and the First Committee, and participated in study visits to IAEA and the Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Organization, at Vienna, and the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons, at The Hague, as well as to Germany and Japan at their invitation. Former fellows commented to the Central Evaluation Unit that the shorter duration of the programme did not reduce its effectiveness. It should be noted that the fellows now have, in general, a good knowledge of disarmament issues, and that the programme can focus on the work of the multilateral bodies. Former fellows believe that more time should be allotted to activities such as simulations or discussion time following lectures. The programme might be compromised if, owing to such factors as the calendar of meetings, its duration is further reduced. Many fellows observed that additional country visits, if possible in different regional groups, should be offered as they provide invaluable insight into different national disarmament perspectives. Former fellows stressed that one of the most valuable features of the programme was the diversity of participants, which reflected that of the membership of disarmament bodies. The disarmament fellowship programme is the most successful United Nations training programme reviewed by the Central Evaluation Unit.

62. Including the 1998 programme, 475 government officials from over 140 Member States have received training under the programme since its inception. An examination of the list of delegations to the disarmament bodies, since 1996, shows that between 10 and 20 representatives of States are former fellows. At the end of 1998, a sample of sponsoring Governments responding to a survey by the Central Evaluation Unit provided information on the current assignments of former fellows; in most cases assignments were still connected to disarmament-related issues. The findings of the Unit's 1991 in-depth evaluation were comparable. The composition of the groups generally follows the guidelines established for the programme; additional guidelines may be needed to reflect mandates such as gender balance. Women's participation varies: of 24 fellows in 1997, 10 were women; in 1998, there were only 4 women. Governments should be encouraged to nominate qualified women to the programme. It is noted that stipends granted to the fellows are clearly insufficient to cover the costs of lodging and subsistence; this is particularly pronounced in locations where fellows do not stay for long periods, such as The Hague, and where special arrangements cannot be made. The Department for Disarmament Affairs should assess the situation and propose corrective measures, taking into account existing regulations.

VI. Information

63. In the Final Document of its first special session devoted to disarmament, the General Assembly stressed the importance of information activities to mobilize world public opinion, to encourage study and research and to avoid dissemination of false and tendentious information. It was recommended that throughout this process of disseminating information about developments in the disarmament field of all countries, there should be increased participation by non-governmental organizations concerned with the matter, through closer liaison between them and the United Nations (resolution S-10/2, paras. 99 and 103–105).

64. The function of disseminating information on disarmament issues was formalized in 1982 at the second special session. The World Disarmament Campaign was then launched to promote global information and education on these issues; it focused on elected representatives, research institutes, educational communities, non-governmental organizations and the media. In 1992, the Secretary-General stated that, as a result of the changed international environment, during the past few years, the Secretariat had adjusted its information programme to allow for a more pointed approach as regards the role of the United Nations in international peace and security (A/47/469, para. 6). The name of the Campaign was changed to the Disarmament Information Programme. The two most recent medium-term plans maintain the approach envisaged at the first special session to provide, on one hand, information to specialized groups in governmental and non-governmental sectors and, on the other hand, to inform a public less well-versed in disarmament matters (A/47/6/Rev.1,[7] para. 7.32). The programme is expected to facilitate the exchange of ideas between governmental and non-governmental sectors. (General Assembly resolution 51/219, annex, programme 1, new para. 1.19).

Income of the disarmament trust fund for the United Nations Disarmament Information Programme

(Thousands of dollars)

1990–1991	*1992–1993*	*1994–1995*	*1996–1997*
2 661.6	681.1	257.0	387.9

A. Publications

65. In 1992, six recurrent publications, of various periodicity, constituted the core of the information programme. Owing to the continuing decline in voluntary contributions and a number of cost-efficiency measures, the number of publications was gradually reduced. The Disarmament Study Series, the Topical Papers and the *Disarmament Newsletter* were discontinued. All Government and non-governmental organization representatives interviewed by the Central Evaluation Unit, although they understood the financial constraints, regretted this trend. They appreciated the discussion of issues by experts and the overview of new developments on specific topics presented with the objectivity and balance expected from the Organization. The quarterly publication *Disarmament: A Periodic Review by the United Nations*, was discontinued in 1998; the intention is to replace it with the publication of occasional papers — reproduction of outstanding papers presented at various conferences.

66. The two remaining publications, *The United Nations Disarmament Yearbook* and the *Status of Multilateral Arms Regulation and Disarmament Agreements*, are appreciated by the users as reference tools. *The United Nations Disarmament Yearbook*, first published in 1976, is focused on the review of the main developments and negotiations in the field of disarmament and arms regulation. Although representatives regularly consult a number of other publications, such as the *Yearbook of World Armaments and Disarmament* of the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), the following comment made to the Central Evaluation Unit by a representative in the First Committee encapsulates a common experience: "The *Yearbook* served as an important backgrounder. In fact, whenever there were factual disagreements between delegations in informal meetings, the *Yearbook* would be consulted". The 1997 edition of the *Yearbook* was issued in July 1998, and did not reach missions at Geneva until October 1998. Representatives commented that it would be useful to receive the *Yearbook* as early as possible in the year. This is not impossible but publication is sometimes delayed because staff of the Department for Disarmament Affairs responsible for drafting sections of the *Yearbook* are engaged in priority activities, such as the servicing of a negotiating body. Moreover, the distribution of publications by the Department, in general, became problematic after reduction of personnel in 1996. For example, the transcripts of the 1997 non-governmental organization/Department forums had not yet been distributed at the end of 1998. The maintenance of mailing lists was also affected.

67. In its 1991 in-depth evaluation, the Central Evaluation Unit recommended that the Department for Disarmament Affairs periodically utilize feedback mechanisms to determine the use being made of publications and services it provides and to elicit suggestions for improvements. During the period under review two readership surveys were conducted. Comments on the publications were generally positive but could not be the basis for improvements. In particular the number of responses received, 10 per cent of the questionnaires distributed for the *Yearbook* — although this is considered a good rate by publishing industry standards — was not sufficiently representative. The matter was discussed at the July 1998 meeting of the Secretariat Publications Board; members of the Board expressed doubts about the effectiveness of this type of broad survey. The Sales and Marketing Section of the Department of Public Information agreed to work with the Department for Disarmament Affairs and the Department of Economic and Social Affairs on a pilot project to obtain concrete and targeted comments from the appropriate user groups.

68. In addition to the need for technical studies mentioned in paragraph 32 above, comments made by representatives to the Central Evaluation Unit covered needs for information that appears to be available but is not necessarily consolidated or published. For example, many representatives, mostly at Geneva, stated that, when they do not participate in the work of the First Committee, they have difficulties in assessing the work of the General Assembly session just completed. Suggestions by representatives to the Conference on Disarmament included highlighting new wording in the case of "repeat" resolutions, charting relations between resolutions, and indicating difficult points in the deliberations, all this being needed at the beginning of the session of the Conference, in January. A certain amount of information can be found in other documents, and on the Department for Disarmament Affairs website. For example, the entry "Disarmament resolutions and decisions of the ___ session of the United Nations General Assembly", available on the Department's home page from the beginning of January, provides information on the sponsorship and voting patterns of the resolutions adopted in December. The

Department's database on the activities of the First Committee, which contains texts of resolutions and decisions and information on sponsorship and voting patterns since the fifty-second session, is also available on the home page. However, the number of comments made points to the need to review the way in which information is presented or disseminated by the United Nations.

69. Comments on other topics pointed to the same difficulty of accessing existing information. At Geneva, delegations stated that they did not have a clear idea of the new initiatives promoted by the Department in New York. Also at Geneva, non-governmental organization representatives mentioned that they had been informed of initiatives such as the mechanism for Coordinating Action on Small Arms through other non-governmental organizations, not by the Department. In view of the lack of resources to support an effective publication programme, the Department is placing an increasing amount of information on its website. Although such dissemination cannot replace the need for publications, there is a demand for it. For example, in its submission to the Central Evaluation Unit, one intergovernmental organization in the Asia and Pacific region suggested that the Department for Disarmament Affairs home page include agendas for meetings the Department is responsible for and relevant papers as soon as practicable. This would assist such organizations in deciding whether or not to attend meetings and how to prepare for meetings. Where papers are sent by mail, they often arrive too late. To facilitate access to a larger amount of quality information, several representatives of research institutions and non-governmental organizations suggested to the Evaluation Unit that, short of playing the role of a clearing house which would be labour-intensive and politically sensitive, the Department could expand its practice of drafting annotated bibliographies by preparing an annotated list of the Internet sites of a number of reputable research institutions. Annotations would consist mainly of a description of the contents of the different sites. A similar suggestion was made regarding information on United Nations publications and information services to help users not familiar with the resources, and looking for information on specific subjects. The two disarmament reference libraries could respond to a number of these needs.

B. Reference libraries

70. Delegations appreciate having access to the documents of the deliberative and negotiating bodies in the New York and Geneva disarmament reference libraries. They observed that the Geneva library is the only one, worldwide, to maintain comprehensive holdings of documents of the Conference on Disarmament and review conferences of existing multilateral disarmament treaties. The two librarians offer guidance or prepare responses to queries in relation to these collections. However, the function of a specialized documentation centre has not been sufficiently developed. Delegations would like the librarians to offer guidance on how to access information on scientific and technical aspects of disarmament not necessarily reflected in the United Nations documentation. They should be able to point to existing documentation available at the United Nations or through other sources, and to prepare bibliographies and facilitate access to documents. Librarians at the library of the United Nations Office at Geneva believe that it would be useful to review the functions of the disarmament libraries, so that the Department librarians focus on functions not already fulfilled by the central libraries, avoiding duplicative services to users, or aspects of document processing, such as indexing, normally the responsibility of the central libraries. The collection of documents published by research institutes, specialized non-governmental organizations and governmental agencies — useful to Department staff, delegations and other users — is kept up to date under a limited acquisition plan and an exchange programme. For example, the Geneva disarmament library receives about 80 journals and publications addressed to it by other institutions and on circulation from the central library of the United Nations Office at Geneva. The trust fund established in 1978 to maintain the collection of the Geneva disarmament library is used sporadically. In contrast, UNIDIR receives journals and publications from over 300 sources. In accordance with its statute (see para. 32 above), UNIDIR is assisting delegations in their search for documentation. At Geneva, the Department and UNIDIR would benefit from setting up a jointly managed research and reference collection. This could be done under the supervision of the Department librarian, a half-time position.

C. Role of non-governmental organizations

71. Non-governmental organizations helped to revive the efforts for a comprehensive nuclear test ban, and played an active role in promoting the Chemical Weapons Convention. Two organizations in consultative status with the Economic and Social Council were awarded the Nobel Peace Prize for their efforts to promote a nuclear-weapon-free world — International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War in 1985 and the Pugwash Conference on Science and World Affairs in 1995. In 1997, the Prize was awarded to the

International Campaign to Ban Landmines and Jody Williams, its founder.

72. The expert knowledge of a number of non-governmental organizations is useful to many delegations, particularly at Geneva, where the role of the Department for Disarmament Affairs is to provide substantive and administrative support to the Conference on Disarmament and the review conferences of existing multilateral disarmament treaties, as well as to implement the fellowship programme. At Geneva, almost all briefings and round tables are organized by non-governmental organizations and by UNIDIR, sometimes with the participation of Secretariat staff. For example, during the past two years, in collaboration with the Department of Peace Studies of the University of Bradford, United Kingdom, the Quaker United Nations Office, Geneva, assisted the work of the ad hoc group on the Biological Weapons Convention. This has consisted mainly of the preparation of a series of technical papers which are presented at a special briefing, set up with the collaboration of the Department for Disarmament Affairs, at some point during each of the sessions of the ad hoc group. The briefing sessions are always well attended by the representatives, and a number of them requested that the papers be distributed in advance of meetings so that they could discuss among themselves the substance presented.

73. The Department for Disarmament Affairs has also facilitated the participation of non-governmental organizations in the work of intergovernmental conferences to the fullest extent permitted by the rules of procedure governing those conferences (A/51/219, para. 15). However, the current limitations on such participation has prevented the contributions of non-governmental organizations from being as effective as they could have been. They cannot make oral or written presentations to the First Committee or the Disarmament Commission. They may send communications to the Conference on Disarmament. Communications are held in deposit by the Secretary-General of the Conference, and are made available to delegations upon request, which is a rare occurrence. In 1991 and 1996, the Special NGO Committee on Disarmament (Geneva) made suggestions for the development of closer relations between the Conference and non-governmental organizations active in the field, with the aim of helping such organizations to obtain a better appreciation of the work being done by the Conference and difficulties to be overcome. In 1996, the Economic and Social Council recommended to the General Assembly to examine the question of the participation of non-governmental organizations in all areas of the work of the United Nations, in the light of the experience gained through the *arrangements for consultation between non-governmental* organizations and the Council (decision 1996/297). The same year, the NGO Committee on Disarmament (New York) presented proposals for enlarging the contribution of non-governmental organizations to the work of the First Committee. At special conferences and meetings, such as the three special sessions devoted to disarmament and the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development in 1987, one to two days were set aside by the committee of the whole for selected non-governmental organizations to make oral presentations. In his concluding statement, the President of the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons stated that arrangements for communication should be improved to encourage maximum exchange of ideas between non-governmental organizations and delegates during the Preparatory Committee meetings and at review conferences, and that the Centre for Disarmament Affairs could take on the organization of these improved contacts. The Preparatory Committee for the 2000 Review Conference decided that time would be made available at each session for representatives of non-governmental organizations to address delegations; this was implemented at the 1997 and 1998 sessions. Members of the Special NGO Committee on Disarmament (Geneva) stated to OIOS that a more structured interaction with the Department for Disarmament Affairs than currently exists is needed to bridge the gap between non-governmental organizations and the United Nations; regular consultations between the Department and those organizations would provide an opportunity to exchange views on the work of the Department and on what contributions the organizations could make.

74. Representatives who provided comments to the Central Evaluation Unit on the Department for Disarmament Affairs/NGO panels organized during disarmament week found that they were useful forums for delegations to exchange views with non-governmental organizations. In a written submission, one representative observed that unfortunately the series of seminars were held during a very intensive period of Committee work, which meant that many interested delegations were unable to attend the seminars; it would be advisable to hold these seminars, for instance, right after the general debate in the General Assembly. Seminars are organized on a more regular basis at Geneva than is the case in New York, owing to an active programme by UNIDIR and other institutions. The First Committee does not benefit from a programme of special events similar to those organized by the Department of Economic and Social Affairs for delegations to the Second and Third Committees.

During the fifty-third session of the General Assembly, for example, 27 panels and briefings were organized by that Department for those two Committees. Delegations consider that panels and briefings provide them with useful background information on many of the specific issues being debated in the Committees. During disarmament week in 1998, the Department for Disarmament Affairs organized one symposium on the de-alerting of nuclear weapons, which was well attended. Such events cost little or nothing and demonstrate the usefulness of the Secretariat in a convener role. Other topics could have been equally useful, if they had not duplicated what non-governmental organizations were doing.

D. Awareness of United Nations disarmament activities

75. Indications of the interest in disarmament issues are somewhat contradictory. The interest of Governments is rather high; over 130 statements in the opening debate at the fifty-third session of the General Assembly addressed one or more of over 30 disarmament topics. On the other hand, publications on disarmament are not major sales items — United Nations publications, by the Department for Disarmament Affairs or UNIDIR, as well as publications of well-known research institutions, such as SIPRI. Besides the relative low visibility of the United Nations disarmament activities compared with other critical issues, during the last decade, several specialists explained that the diversification of disarmament issues and the increasingly technical nature of topics made it difficult to reach a wider audience.

76. Statistics on coverage of disarmament by news agencies show that, during the 1990s, the United Nations is increasingly mentioned in reference to disarmament.[9] In 1990, 10 per cent of stories on disarmament made at least one reference to the United Nations; in 1998, the proportion was over 50 per cent. Press correspondents explained to the Central Evaluation Unit that, in the 1990s, there was less focus on bilateral negotiations and that, by default, the number of references to the United Nations increased. Examination of a sample of full texts of stories on disarmament with reference to the United Nations filed in May and August 1998 shows that only 10 per cent of stories covered substantive aspects of the work of the United Nations. All other stories reported were country-specific situations, with little information on the overall disarmament challenge. Spokespersons in the Department of Public Information facilitate the work of correspondents by, for example, at Geneva, making copies of all statements available to correspondents at the same time they are distributed to delegations. However, the Department for Disarmament Affairs itself did not define a strategy to involve the specialized press, which consists mostly of foreign affairs correspondents. In 1991, the Evaluation Unit had suggested that the Department designate a focal point to deal with the press on substantive matters.

77. Many disarmament issues cannot be popularized, as nuclear testing or landmines were, and require the more painstaking approach of public education, as recommended in the Final Document of the first special session. Fewer institutions exist in disarmament than in such fields as environment or health to provide a stream of information and give weight to the issue. The United Nations — mandated to disseminate information which is factually correct, balanced and objective — cannot rely entirely on the advocacy organizations that exist. The United Nations needs to examine ways to disseminate materials that can be used with popular audiences, with particular attention to integrating disarmament to the wider perspective of peace and sustainable development, so that it is not perceived as a technical branch out of touch with important socio-political realities (report of the Advisory Board, in its capacity of Board of Trustees of UNIDIR (A/51/364, annex II, para. 17)). In 1998, the Advisory Board discussed the suggestion made to convene a special extended meeting or electronic conference of the Board with the aim of bringing into the discussion of this particular issue experts from fields such as education, the media, public relations, and non-governmental organizations. Representatives of non-governmental organizations considered it important to involve delegations — in particular from States which might be persuaded to invest in the revival of the information service — and interested parties from the private sector or foundations.

VII. Recommendations

78. The following recommendations are based on the findings presented in sections III, IV, V and VI of the present report.

Recommendation 1. Resources for disarmament activities

(a) *Regular budget resources.* Disarmament is one of the priority areas of work of the Organization. The priorities agreed upon at the first special session of the

[9] See Nexis-Wires, an electronic database containing the wires service stories of most news agencies worldwide.

General Assembly devoted to disarmament remain pressing and additional tasks have been mandated. The Secretariat should present, in the context of the review by the Committee for Programme and Coordination of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2000–2001, budget proposals to restore regular budget funding to a level comparable, in real terms, to that allocated in the 1990–1991 budget when the disarmament programme was last organized at the departmental level. This would permit the Department to provide the needed services in mandated priority areas, in particular in relation to the provision of technical information to Member States, support for, and promotion of, regional disarmament efforts and initiatives, and the promotion of a better understanding of the United Nations endeavours in the field of disarmament [see paras. 2, 11–12, 15, 19, 25, 31, 40, 44, 47, 60, 62, 65, 66, 74 and 77 above];

(b) *Supplementary resources*. Fund-raising for extrabudgetary resources should be pursued more actively by different branches of the Department for Disarmament Affairs; the primary strategy for such fund-raising should be to tie fund-raising to specific projects; the Department should seek the assistance of members of the Advisory Board on Disarmament Matters in fund-raising [see paras. 54, 64 and 77 above].

Recommendation 2. Reports for consideration of the First Committee

For the fifty-fourth and fifty-fifth sessions of the General Assembly, the Department for Disarmament Affairs should develop further the practice of providing factual summaries as an introduction or annex to a selection of the reports it prepares at the request of the Assembly. Such summaries should aim at facilitating the work of delegations and, at first, should cover topics which are largely of a technical nature. After this initial period of experience, the Department should assess to what extent this initiative has been useful to delegations and, as appropriate, expand it to cover a wider range of reports [see para. 19 above].

Recommendation 3. Multilateral agreements

(a) In keeping with existing legal provisions regarding the role of the Secretariat, and in collaboration with relevant treaty organizations and regional organizations, the Department for Disarmament Affairs should promote the ratification of disarmament treaties by facilitating the exchange of information between interested States and by undertaking, at the request of Governments, advisory services and technical assistance [see paras. 25 and 47];

(b) In accordance with the central role of the United Nations in the sphere of disarmament, which involves facilitating all disarmament measures and being kept informed of all disarmament efforts, as declared in paragraph 114 of the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session, the Department should facilitate the exchange of experience between treaty-implementing organizations [see para. 27 above].

Recommendation 4. Increased collaboration in research

In the context of existing mandates, as adopted in the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session and subsequent General Assembly resolutions, the Department for Disarmament Affairs should explore modalities for increased collaboration with UNIDIR, organizations of the United Nations system, the research community and non-governmental organizations. This collaboration should be aimed at providing a greater volume of studies and technical information in response to existing and future requests of Member States [see paras. 29–31 and 72 above].

Recommendation 5. UNIDIR

The Department for Disarmament Affairs and UNIDIR should develop proposals for alleviating difficulties regarding the current financial and organizational arrangements adopted in implementation of the statute of UNIDIR, while maintaining its autonomous status. These proposals should be submitted to the General Assembly for consideration at its fifty-fifth session [see paras. 32–34 above].

Recommendation 6. Contingency access by the Department for Disarmament Affairs to external databases

Arrangements should be worked out between the Department for Disarmament Affairs and the relevant Secretariat departments and international organizations to facilitate access by the Department to disarmament-related information contained in their databases, so that the Department can access such databases when specific requests require it to compile information in them [see paras. 38–40 above].

Recommendation 7. Collaboration with regional organizations

(a) To establish effective liaison and cooperation with regional organizations, as recommended by the Disarmament Commission, the Department for

Disarmament Affairs should conclude agreements or memoranda of understanding with regional organizations, *inter alia*, to facilitate the exchange of experience between regions or to assist in the implementation of confidence-building measures adopted by Member States at the regional or subregional levels [see paras. 42–47 above];

(b) Department staff should maintain working-level contacts with staff of other organizations involved in disarmament-related programmes, to facilitate continued consultation or collaboration. In particular, working-level staff of other organizations should be kept informed regularly of the progress of a project or report to which they contributed. To avoid cumbersome procedures, the Department should explore the potential of targeted and secure electronic transmissions such as list-service e-mail arrangements [see paras. 46–47 above].

Recommendation 8. Dissemination of information to targeted audiences and the general public

To enhance the dissemination of information, the Department for Disarmament Affairs should:

(a) Request the Advisory Board on Disarmament Matters, with the participation of relevant substantive organizations, including the relevant treaty organizations, the Department of Public Information and communication professionals, to make proposals for a disarmament public information strategy. Proposals should include a set of measures to reach the specialized press and media, and channels of public education [see paras. 76–77 above];

(b) Sensitize potential donors to the importance of this information strategy to advance the cause of disarmament [see paras. 64 and 77 above];

(c) In addition to existing arrangements, conduct regular consultations, once a year or more frequently if needed, with non-governmental organization Committees and key non-governmental organizations and research institutions with the aim of permitting them to make a greater contribution to intergovernmental disarmament deliberations and negotiations under existing rules and procedures [see paras. 71–74 above].

(*Signed*) Karl Th. **Paschke**
Under-Secretary-General
for Internal Oversight Services